UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/835,559	04/17/2001	Mark T. Corl	2916-0129P	5910

			EXAMINER
2292	7590	05/03/2006	HUYNH, SON P

BIRCH STEWART KOLASCH & BIRCH
PO BOX 747
FALLS CHURCH, VA 22040-0747

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2623	

DATE MAILED: 05/03/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PTO-90C (Rev. 10/03)

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	09/835,559	CORL, MARK T.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Son P. Huynh	2623

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>03</u> MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>08 February 2006</u>.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL.**   2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-3 and 5-31* is/are pending in the application.

   4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-3 and 5-31* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on <u>08 February 2006</u> is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

   Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

   Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

   a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

   1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

   2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

   3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

   * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
   Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
   Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6)☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

1.   Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-3, 5-31 have been considered but

are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claims 4 and 32 have been canceled.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

2.   35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

> Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of
> matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the
> conditions and requirements of this title.

3.   Claims 13, 5-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention

is directed to non-statutory subject matter.

Claims 1-3 and 5-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is

directed to non-functional descriptive material.

Claims 1-3, 5-21 merely recite a "digital television signal", which comprises a

"PSIP table..." which is data structure (mere arrangement of facts or data). This claim is

merely a disembodied television signal and is analyzed as descriptive matter per se.

(MPEP 2106[R3] IV B 1).

Claim 22 merely recites "a method to generate program and system information

protocol data about digital television DTV content" the "PSIP data including at least one

PSIP table.." which merely claim nonfunctional descriptive material (abstract ideas).

The invention as claimed in claims 1-3, 5-22 is not a process, machine,

manufacture, or composition of matter since it is directed to non-functional descriptive

matter. Therefore, 35 U.S.C. 101 rejection is properly applied.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

4.   The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly
> claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

5.   Claims 22-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being

indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which

applicant regards as the invention.

Regarding claims 22-26 make reference to a preceding claim 1. The format of making

reference to limitations recited in claim 1 results in confusion. Therefore, rejection under

35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph is properly applied (see MPEP 2173.05 (f)).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set
> forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and
> the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the
> invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.
> Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

7.   Claims 1-3, 5-31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

"PROGRAM AND SYSTEM INFORMATION PROTOCOL FOR TERRESTRIAL

BROADCAST AND CABLE" (hereinafter referred to as Doc. A/65) in view of Ozkan et

al. (WO 99/20049).

Regarding claim 1, Doc. A/65 discloses digital television signal for use in a digital

television receiver (e.g. receiver that receives television signal with PSIP tables – page

9) for receiving program and system information protocol (PSIP) data about digital

television (DTV) content from a broadcast transmitter (transmitter that transmits

television signal with PSIP tables – page 9), the digital television signal comprising a

PSIP table (page 9), wherein the PSIP table comprises:

an information type descriptor including an information type identification field

that contains a code specifying a data type of extra information associated with a virtual

channel or an event in a DTV data stream (e.g. information descriptor such as channel

type, table type, service type, etc. including identification field that contain code

specifying data type of extra information such as specific source of video, text, data, or

audio program, length, etc. associated with a virtual channel or an event in EIT table of

DTV data stream – see page 14 section 6.1-page 42, section 6.8);

an extended information descriptor including an information expected usage field

that includes a first field describing an expected usage of the extra information(e.g.

descriptor including program rate, program name, program source, channel number,

start time, title, etc. - see page 11 section 5-page 42, section 6.8). However, Doc. A/65

does not specifically disclose the expected usage including a display option of the extra

information.

Ozkan, in an analogous art of providing for use in a digital television receiver for

receiving program and system information protocol (PSIP) data about digital television

content from a broadcast transmitter (page 5, lines 17-25, figures 1-2,18). the digital

television signal comprising PSIP table, wherein the PSIP table comprising an extended

information descriptor including an information expected usage field that includes a first

field describing an expected usage of the extra information (e.g. tables comprises

information descriptor such as program titles, program source, channel number, time,

etc. - see including, but are not limited to, page 6, line 1- page 13, line 23, figures 2-16),

the expected usage including a display option of the extra information (e.g. the

television signal comprises program guide that contains multimedia objects and

provides a user interface the supports Emails, Internet browsing, home shopping, etc..

Internet webpage data or still images may be displayed in area 435 in response to user selection of preview icon – see including, but are not limited to, figure 2, page 8, lines 5-18). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Doc. A/65 to use the teaching as taught by Ozkan in order to at least access data from different service providers easily by selection of icon on the interface (page 5, lines 1-10; page 7, lines 9-25, page 8, lines 6-18, page 10, lines 1-10).

Regarding claim 2, Doc A/65 in view of Ozkan teaches a digital television signal as discussed in the rejection of claim 1. Doc. A/65 further discloses the information type description and the extended information descriptor includes: a descriptor tag field; and a descriptor length segment (e.g. see including, but are not limited to, page 36 – page 42).

Regarding claim 3, Doc A/65 in view of Ozkan teaches a digital television signal as discussed in the rejection of claim 2. Doc. A/65 further discloses the descriptor tag field has a value for the information type descriptor and a value for an extended information descriptor field (see page 9, section 4.2, page 36-page 42). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use a value of 0xC9 for the information type descriptor field and a value of 0xC8 for extended information descriptor field in order to achieve developer's desire.

Regarding claim 5, Doc A/65 in view of Ozkan teaches a digital television signal as

discussed in the rejection of claim 1. Doc. A/65 further discloses the code included in

the information type identification field characterizes the extra information as one of: an

MPEG-formatted video file, an ASCII text file, JPEG formatted image file, or an MPEG

formatted audio file, (see including, but are not limited to, page 10, paragraph 2, page

18, paragraph 6, page 19, last paragraph, page 22, last paragraph, page 24, paragraph

1, page 30, paragraph 5, page 44, page 49, section C1 –page 52, page 70, section D1,

page 78). Alternatively, Ozkan also discloses the coded included in the information type

identification field characterizes the extra information as one of an MPEG-formatted

video file, an ASCII text file, JPEG formatted image file, HTML-formatted text file –

page 5, lines 12-20, page 8, lines 7-18, page 10, lines 1-10).

Regarding claim 6, Doc A/65 in view of Ozkan teaches a digital television signal as

discussed in the rejection of claim 1. Doc. A/65 further disclosed the information type

descriptor includes an information description length field; and an information

description text field (page 18, section 6.3, page 24; page 30,section 6.5-page 42,

section 6.8). Alternatively, Ozkan further discloses the information type descriptor

includes information description length field and an information description text field

(see figures 2, 6-16).

Regarding claim 7, Doc A/65 in view of Ozkan teaches a digital television signal as

discussed in the rejection of claim 6. Doc. A/65 further discloses the information

description length field identifies a length of the information description text field (e.g.

rating description length field identifies a length of rating description text field – page 37,

paragraph 7). Alternatively, Ozkan further discloses the information description length

field identifies a length of the information description text field (e.g. information

description length identifies duration/size of program/object in program guide– figure 2,

page 25, lines 1-18).

Regarding claim 8, Doc A/65 in view of Ozkan teaches a digital television signal as

discussed in the rejection of claim 6. Doc. A/65 further discloses the information

description text field includes text that characterizes the extra information associated

with the virtual channel or an event in a DTV data stream (e.g. program title, rating, etc.

see including, but is not limited to, page 26 – page 42). Alternatively, Ozkan further

discloses the information description text field includes text that characterizes the extra

information associated with a virtual channel or an event in a DTV data stream (e.g.

additional information such as internet web site, advertisement associated with the

channel – figure 2, page 8, lines 6-25).

Regarding claim 9, Doc A/65 in view of Ozkan teaches a digital television signal as

discussed in the rejection of claim 8. Doc. A/65 further discloses the information type

identification field includes code description (e.g. program title, rating, etc.)

corresponding to the text description in the information description text field (pages 24-

42, 70-81).

Regarding claim 10, Doc A/65 in view of Ozkan teaches a digital television signal as

discussed in the rejection of claim 1. Doc. A/65 further discloses the extended

information descriptor further includes an information location length field (PID, channel,

source, etc.); and an information location text field (e.g. channel name, program title,

rating, etc. – pages 24-42, 71-80). Alternatively, Ozkan further discloses the extended

information descriptor includes an information location length field (program location,

source, etc.) and an information location text field (location of object name/title, etc.

figures 2, 6-16, page 8, lines 6-18).

Regarding claim 11, Doc A/65 in view of Ozkan teaches a digital television signal as

discussed in the rejection of claim 1. Ozkan further discloses additional program specific

information describing and supplementing items within the hierarchical tables is

conveyed within descriptor information elements, the decoder identifies particular

multimedia objects. The data structures enables objects to be positioned anywhere in a

program guide and to be associated with individual program specific information table

elements such as preview 447 is positioned associated with ICECAPADES icon,

Results 445 associated with World Cup, etc. (page 7, line 1-30, figure 2). Ozkan further

discloses multimedia comprises advertisements and animation may be displayed in

area 437 (page 8, lines 6-18 – figure 2). Thus, the information expected usage field

inherently includes a second field that describes the extra information as being an

advertisement or not and the third field that describe a location on a screen where the

creator of the extended information descriptor anticipates that a representation of the extra information should be position (e.g. in area 437) so that the advertisement and animation are identified and displayed in area 437.

Regarding claim 12, Doc A/65 in view of Ozkan teaches a digital television signal as discussed in the rejection of claim 1. Doc. A/65 further discloses the first field describes the extra information as one of: extended event, extended program guide (EPG) information that is to be displayed during an EPG display when an event is selected (e.g. display program guide information/EIT when master program guide is selected – page 11-page 13); extended event selected information that is to be displayed when an event is selected (e.g. displaying ETT tables when MGT is selected-page 13); or extended channel EPG information that is to be displayed during an EPG display when a channel is selected (displaying channel information when channel is selected – pages 26-28, 85). Alternatively, Ozkan further discloses the first field describes the extra information as one of: extended event, extended program guide information that is to be displayed during an EPG display when an event is selected (e.g. user selection to display program guide – figure 2); extended event selected information that is to be displayed when an event is selected (e.g. user selection to display a web page, program, advertisement, etc. figure 2);

extended channel EPG information that is to be displayed during an EPG display when a channel is selected (i.e. user selection of a particular channel such as CBS on the program guide – figure 2);

extended channel selected information that is to be displayed when a channel is selected (figure 2); and user defined information (i.e. user selection of Fax, Phone, Email, etc. – figure 2).

Regarding claim 13, Doc A/65 in view of Ozkan teaches a digital television signal as discussed in the rejection of claim 10, Ozkan further discloses the information location length field identifies a remaining length of the extended information descriptor as determined by the information location text field (further information associated with the program title field, program channel field, web page field, etc. – figure 2).

Regarding claim 14, Doc A/65 in view of Ozkan teaches a digital television signal as discussed in the rejection of claim 10. Ozkan further discloses the information location text field includes a string of text that is interpreted as a URL (i.e. URL of web page or URL of WWW site – page 8, lines 6-18, page 10, lines 5-10, figure 2).

Regarding claim 15, Doc A/65 in view of Ozkan teaches a digital television signal as discussed in the rejection of claim 14. Ozkan further disclose the user access Internet address (e.g. URL 905) for additional information that is associated with the television program received at the receiver (page 8, lines 6-18, page 10, lines 1-10, page 12, liens 3-15, figure 2). The URL (i.e. URL address 905) is a reference to a data program within the DTV data stream or data external to the DTV data stream.

Regarding claim 16, Doc A/65 in view of Ozkan teaches a digital television signal as

discussed in the rejection of claim 15. Ozkan further discloses the external data is from

the world wide web (WWW) – WWW site – page 8, lines 6-18, page 10, lines 1-10, page

12, lines 3-15).

Regarding claim 17, Doc A/65 in view of Ozkan teaches a digital television signal as

discussed in the rejection of claim 15. Ozkan further discloses the data from the WWW

site and URL address (page 8, lines 6-18, page 10, lines 1-10, page 12, lines 3-15).

Inherently, the data program within the DTV data stream is referenced with a path

beginning as http:// www.

Regarding claim 18, Doc A/65 in view of Ozkan teaches a digital television signal as

discussed in the rejection of claim 1. Doc A/65 further discloses a link between an

information type descriptor and at least one of a virtual channel table and an event

information table (page 9, page 11-33).

Regarding claim 19, Doc A/65 in view of Ozkan teaches a digital television signal as

discussed in the rejection of claim 1. Doc. A/65 further discloses a link between the

extended information descriptor segment and virtual channel table (pages 9-33).

Regarding claim 20, Doc A/65 in view of Ozkan teaches a digital television signal as

discussed in the rejection of claim 1. Ozkan further discloses the first field describes the

extra information as being: intended to be displayed during a displaying of an EPG (e.g. additional information, web information, etc. – figure 2).

Regarding claim 21, Doc A/65 in view of Ozkan teaches a digital television signal as discussed in the rejection of claim 1. Ozkan further discloses the third field describes the location (position of the objects) as being lower right of the display screen (e.g. advertisement and animation may be displayed in area 437-figure 2, page 8, lines 6-18).

Regarding claim 22, the limitations of a method as claimed is broader than the limitation of the digital television signal as claimed in claim 1, and are analyzed as discussed in the rejection of claim 1.

Regarding claim 23, the limitations of PSIP generator as claimed is broader than the limitations of the digital television signal as claimed in claim 1, and are analyzed as discussed with respect to the rejection of claim 1.

Regarding claim 24, Doc A/65 in view of Ozkan teaches a digital television signal as discussed in the rejection of claim 1. It is obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art that the generator is embodied on a computer running software so that the processor automatically performs the functions.

Regarding claim 25, Doc A/65 in view of Ozkan teaches a digital television signal as discussed in the rejection of claim 24. Ozkan further discloses the type of object being described (e.g. Email MINE format, Internet HTML, etc.) – page 10, lines 6-8). However, neither Doc A/65 nor Ozkan specifically discloses the software is written in the language Java. Official Notice is taken that writing software in the language Java is well known in the art. For example, writing software in language Java for user interface such as program guide, web page, etc. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Doc A/65 in view of Ozkan to use the well-known teaching in the art in order to modify the content/object on the user interface/web page easily.

Regarding claim 26, the limitations of computer readable article as claimed correspond to the limitations of memory as claimed in claim 1. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to embody software to generate PSIP data about digital television content in order that the instructions could be automatically performed by a processor.

Regarding claim 27, Doc. A/65 in view of Ozkan discloses a method to generate an extended program guide (EPG) display about content in a digital television (DTV) stream of data packets (generate master program guide with multiple tables that contains links between objects, channel information, program name, start time, program rating, etc. –see A/65, pages 12-42, 71-80), the method comprising:

receiving the DTV stream of data packets, the stream containing at least one

program and system information protocol (receiving data packets in transport stream at

the receiver, the stream containing tables in PSIP standard – see A/65-page 9, page

11-page 13, page 15, section 6-2, page 18, page 30, section 6.5-page 42, pages 71-

84);

recognizing an information type descriptor and an extended information

descriptor within the PSIP table, the information type descriptor includes an information

identification field that contains a code specifying a data type of extra information

associated with a virtual channel or an event in the DTV stream of data packet

(recognizing (by the decoder) an information type descriptor and an extended

information descriptor based on descriptor tag within PSIP table that contains a code

specifying a data type of extra information associated with virtual channel or an event in

DTV stream of data packets such as a program title, program source, an event in EITs,

program rating, etc. – see A/65, page 6, section 3.3-page 7, pages 9-42, pages 71-83),

the extended information descriptor includes an information expected usage field with

includes a first field describing an expected usage of the extra information (e.g. master

program guide comprising field that links to EIT, ETT tables and in EIT, ETT tables

includes fields that link to program name, program time, program channel, program

rating, program source, etc. (interpreted as usage of extra information) – see A/65

pages 9-18, pages 30-42, pages 71-83).

A/65 further discloses system information allows navigation and access to each

of the channels within the transport stream, whereas event description gives the user

content information for browsing and selection (page 71, paragraph 1). Thus, the EPG

display is inherently generated based on at least one of the code included in the

information type identification field and the expected usage described in the first field

(i.e. events in master program guide, in EIT, in ETT, such as program name, channel,

start time, etc.). However, A/65 does not specifically disclose the expected usage

including a display option of the extra information.

Ozkan, in an analogous art, discloses receiver that receives multimedia objects

in tables of PSIP. The objects are used to generate EPG display (figures 1-16, 18). The

tables comprises extended information descriptor includes an information expected

usage field which includes field describing an expected usage of the extra information

(table include field for describing extended information such as advertisement,

animation, web link, object title, etc. – page 7, lines 1-12), the expected usage inlcuding

a display option of the extra information (e.g. displaying program guide with multiple

icons associated with channel, program name, etc. that allow user to select a particular

channel, object to watch, or displaying option such as displaying advertisement and

animation in particular position such as area 437 – figure 2, page 7, lines 12-20, page 8,

lines 5-18). Ozkan further discloses generating the EPG display as a function of at least

one of the code included in the information type identification field and the expected

usage described in the first field (generating EPG display based on program type,

channel, size, object position, etc. – figure 2). Therefore, it would have been obvious to

one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Doc. A/65 to

use the teaching as taught by Ozkan in order to at least access data from different

service providers easily by selection of icon on the interface (page 5, lines 1-10; page 7,

lines 9-25, page 8, lines 6-18, page 10, lines 1-10).

Regarding claim 28, the limitations of the digital television receiver as claimed

correspond to the limitations of the method as claimed in claim 27, and are analyzed as

discussed with respect to the rejection of claim 27.

Regarding claim 29, Doc A/65 in view of Ozkan teaches a receiver at discussed in the

rejection of claim 28. Ozkan further discloses the processor at the receives configures

the devices such as tuner, demodulator, etc. to performs the functions (figure 18, pages

18, line 20- page 27, line 22). It is inherently that at least part of the receiver is

embodied on a computer running software so that the processor performs the functions

automatically.

Regarding claim 30, Doc A/65 in view of Ozkan teaches a digital television signal as

discussed in the rejection of claim 29. Ozkan further discloses the type of object being

described (e.g. Email MINE format, Internet HTML, etc.) – page 10, lines 6-8). However,

neither Doc A/65 nor Ozkan specifically discloses the software is written in the language

Java. Official Notice is taken that writing software in the language Java is well known in

the art. For example, writing software in language Java for user interface such as

program guide, web page, etc. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary

skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Doc A/65 in view of Ozkan

to use the well-known teaching in the art in order to modify the content/object on the user interface/web page easily.

Regarding claim 31, the claim is directed toward embody the method of claim 27 in "computer readable article of manufacture". It would have been obvious to embody the procedures of A/65 in view of Ozkan discussed with respect to claim 27 in a "computer readable article of manufacture" in order that the instructions could be automatically performed by a processor

Conclusion

8.   The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Ozkan et al. (US 7,032,236) discloses multimedia system for processing program guides and associated multimedia objects.

Gong (US 2002/0056103) discloses PSIP and the use of Java objects (paragraph 0042).

Nobakht et al. (US 6,745,223) discloses user terminal for channel based Internet network.

9.   **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time

policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE

MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within

TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not

mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the

shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any

extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later

than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Son P. Huynh whose telephone number is 571-272-

7295. The examiner can normally be reached on 9:00 - 6:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Christopher S. Kelley can be reached on 571-272-7331. The fax phone

number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-

273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the
Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for
published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.
Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.
For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should
you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic
Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

It is noted that Group Art Unit 2611 has been changed to Group Art Unit
2623

SPH
April 26, 2006

HAI TRAN
PRIMARY EXAMINER